

CCDL Testimony

3/6/2023

Name: Lee Hayes

City: New Haven, CT 06511

OPPOSE:

ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE H.B. 6667

&

MICROSTAMPING H.B. 6816

COMMENTS:

To whom it may concern, I want to address my stance on why I oppose H.B. 6667 & H.B. 6816. To summarize, I would closely like to approach H.B. 6667, which addresses the following:

1. Ban open carry for ALL FIREARMS . . . bans both ‘handguns’ and ‘long-guns’, with the only exceptions as “firearms training” and “bona fide hunting”, with no definitions or provisions differentiating ‘loaded’ or ‘unloaded’.
2. Ban “pre-1994” modern sporting arms, currently not banned or restricted under CT law.
3. Ban “CT others”, a type of modern sporting arm, currently not banned or restricted in CT, <but under current law in jeopardy with the ATF pistol brace rule>.
4. Limit the purchase of a handgun to “one per month” AND extend the waiting period for delivery of “ANY FIREARM to 10 days”.
5. Change the age for the purchase of a shotgun or rifle from eighteen (18) to twenty-one (21)’ which to me is blatantly unconstitutional; as an eighteen-year-old is by every test imaginable, at the “age of majority”, and would then be unable to purchase ANY FIREARM, robbing them of their 2nd amendment rights per-se.

These heavy restrictions do not hurt anyone other than law-abiding gun owners and not criminals. Most criminals do not fear the law and do not follow the law. Heavily restricting the law-abiding citizen from protecting his/her home, property, and family will put them in jeopardy of becoming a victim when they don’t have to become one. We should encourage people to fight back and not become another victim of assault or even murder. The unconstitutional Assault Weapons ban passed in 2013 has already heavily restricted many CT residents from possessing firearms to protect themselves and their families. As an owner of pre-1994 firearms and “CT Others” in which these firearms were all legally purchased, I now have to fear that the firearms that protect me will be taken away. It is truly disturbing that firearms that are being legally transferred, are now being targeted by the opposing side. For those that support this bill, I ask

that you take these arguments into consideration when you think about disarming a law-abiding citizen like myself. But, this isn't only about me but is about the rest of the CT residents that have to suffer at the hands of those who show no mercy. Limiting the purchase of a handgun to "one per month" will not solve any crimes if a firearm was illegally possessed by a criminal. Again, criminals usually do not follow the law, no matter how many laws are written in stone. An 18-year-old, who has legally become an adult should absolutely have the ability to protect themselves from the world we tried so hard to protect them from. Before I was 18, the world was beautiful and vivid. After 18, reality struck me like a freight train. Classmates being robbed, assaulted, and killed let me know that in a world full of madness, a firearm was necessary for the preservation of my life.

As far as H.B. 6816, the technological advancement of this is far from ready to implement. Example: When going to a gun range, many gun range go-ers will collect fired casings and "reload" them to use again. If a casing that is micro-stamped and contains the information on your firearm and that said casing you fired at your local gun range is collected by a soon-to-be criminal, this can possibly tie a law-abiding citizen to a crime that he/she did not commit. This technology is something that should be more extensively researched before being implemented into our current set of CT laws.

SUPPORT:

RIGHT TO OWN, POSSESS & CARRY H.B. 6817

COMMENTS:

I fully support H.B. 6817 which is an act concerning an individual's right to own, possess or carry a firearm. As stated in our 2nd Amendment: A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed. Our founding fathers wrote a blueprint for America that details that citizens should absolutely have the right to protect themselves from danger and that is a right that should not be infringed upon. It is truly sad that a state that is known as the "Constitution State" has not lived up to that name. In my own personal experience, before I became a gun owner, I thought I would never have to own a gun. I always thought that guns were for the military and policemen. This all went away when I experienced something that made me feel vulnerable and helpless.

To summarize my experience, I was a victim of a road rage incident after honking at someone after they nearly reversed into my car. The man I honked at pulled a knife out on me while in his car and pointed it at me and my wife in a Mcdonald's parking lot. At this moment, I had no weapon on me. Luckily, I was inside my vehicle and an innocent bystander diffused the situation. This situation could have turned out completely different if I was face-to-face with this man and he decided he wanted to stab me or my wife. I always ask myself, what if this man tried to harm us and we had no weapon to protect us? This is why I carry my firearm every day, to ensure that this never happens again. As a man, vulnerability is just as close to death as death itself. I ask that those reading this, fully examine my experience and take this into consideration when thinking of H.B. 6817. I thank you all for taking the time to read my testimony and I hope that my stance on all of the bills listed has at least allowed you to view them from my perspective. With that being said, stay safe & stay alive.

Sincerely,

Lee Hayes